

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 23 2008

SCOTT & YALLERY-ARTHUR
7306 Georgia Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20012
(202) 882-5770

Date July 23, 2008 Page 1 of 8

SEND TO: NAME: R. Chin

FIRM: U. S. Patents and Trademark Office

FAX: (571) 273-8300 PHONE: (571) 272-1270

SENT BY: NAME: Nigel J. Scott, Esquire

S&Y-A FAX: (202) 722-0040

SUBJECT: Response to Notice of Non-compliance with respect
Application No. 09/912,692 dated 7-16-2008

COMMENTS: _____

ORIGINAL WILL: _____
_____ Follow Via Mail
_____ Follow Via Messenger
_____ Follow Via Overnight

This fax is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee named above, and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this fax, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this fax is strictly prohibited.

If you received this fax in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original fax to us at the above address via the United States Postal Service. We will reimburse any costs you incur in notifying us and returning the fax to us.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 23 2008

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Patent Application of Edward T. Buford, III

Serial No: 09/912,692

Group Art Unit:

Filed: 7/26/2001

Examiner: R. Chin

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20321

Sir:

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION MAILED JULY 16, 2008

This is in response to the Office Action mailed March 24, 2007, the communication dated August 28, 2007; the notice of noncompliance dated September 24, 2007; the notice mailed November 26, 2007 and the notices mailed March 14, 2008 and July 16, 2008. Applicant has corrected the errors cited by the Examiner in the referenced Office Actions. He has removed the text from claims 1 through 16 and claim 18 and has placed the "Complete Listing of all Claims" on a separate sheet. The changes are designed to bring the application in compliance with MPEP Section 714, II. A. and 37CFR 1.121 (c) (4). Applicant has made the changes as requested.

In the May 24, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17 and 19 for obviousness based upon 35 U. S. C. 103 (a). For the record, it should be noted that the Examiner had previously allowed these claims. Specifically, the rejection was based upon the assertion that the referenced claims were unpatentable over Stewart 2,876,477 which teaches a brush having a groove or flute along its longitudinal axis, thus it is demonstrably similar to the grooved bristle described by applicant in his invention. The Examiner supports his rejection by reference to Figs. 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of Stewart.